

# REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are presently pending in the captioned application. Subsequent to the enclosed amendment, claims 1-4 and 7-8 are currently amended and claims 5-6 canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

An Interview was conducted with the Examiner on November 9, 2005, during which time, the Examiner indicated that the pending claims would be allowable subject to certain claim amendments to overcome various indefinite rejections under §112, ¶2. Applicants acknowledge that indication and amend the claims as discussed.

In particular, the independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that the claimed polymerizable monomer is an "ethylenically unsaturated monomer". Support for "ethylenically unsaturated monomers" can be found on page 25, line 9 to page 27, line 11 of the specification.

Claims 1 and 8 have further been amended to recite that when the parts by mass of polymerizable monomer is 100 pbw, the parts by mass of  $\alpha$ -diketone (A) is 0.01-10 pbw. The claims were further amended to reflect that the mass of amine (B) and triazine (C) are also claimed as being relative to 100 parts by mass of  $\alpha$ -diketone compound (A). Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 17, lines 22-29 and page 22, lines 25.

Dependent claims 2-4 have been amended to recite a "one-paste photopolymerizable composition" in line with the antecedent support found for the claims in the independent claim 1.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite a "method" to clearly show that a method is being claimed. Support is found in the claim itself.

The specification has been amended to change the phrase "per 100 parts by weight of" at page 24, line 23, to the phrase "per 100 parts by mass of". The improper term of "weight" was a typographical error for "mass". Support for the proper term of "mass" is found throughout the original text and in particular, at lines 10-11 on page 11 teaching "100 parts by mass" of the polymerizable monomers.

No new matter within the meaning of § 132 has been added by any of the amendments.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to enter the indicated amendments of Appendices A and B allow all presently pending claims.

**1. Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-8**  
**under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The Office Action states:

In claims 1 and 8, the recitation of parts by mass of the photopolymerization initiator renders the claims indefinite for the following reasons. It is not clear what the relationship with respect to parts by mass is between the components of the photopolymerization initiator and the components of the composition. It is suggested that applicant incorporate into the claims the disclosed relationship that when the parts by mass of polymerizable monomer is 100 pbw, the parts by mass of  $\alpha$ -diketone is 0.01-10 pbw (see [0029] in the pre-publication document). The parts by mass of amine (B) and triazine (C) should also be clearly designated as being relative to 100 parts by mass of  $\alpha$ -diketone (A).

The claims are indefinite because they do not clearly recite that the polymerizable monomer is an ethylenically unsaturated monomer, such as the (meth)acrylate monomers and oligomers in the compositions relied upon to show unexpected results.

Claims 2 and 3, drawn to a photopolymerization initiator, lack antecedent basis in claim 1, which is now drawn to a one-paste photopolymerizable composition.

Claim 7 is indefinite because it is not clear whether applicant intends to claim a composition or a method for using the composition. If applicant intends to claim a

method of using the composition, the claim should recite at least one method such as applying and photopolymerizing the composition.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the allowed claims, Applicants have amended the rejected claims. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the canceled subject matter of the class of polymerizable monomers in co-pending applications.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 to recite that when the parts by mass of polymerizable monomer is 100 pbw, the parts by mass of  $\alpha$ -diketone (A) is 0.01-10 pbw and that the mass of amine (B) and triazine (C) are relative to 100 parts by mass of the  $\alpha$ -diketone (A).

The Office Action rejected claims 2-4 drawn to a photopolymerization initiator because the claims allegedly lack antecedent basis in claim 1 drawn to a one-paste photopolymerizable composition. Claims 2-4 have now been amended to recite the limitation of a "one-paste" in the preamble.

The Office Action rejected claim 7 because it was allegedly not clear whether the claim intended to claim a composition or a method for using the composition. Claim 7 has been amended to recite a method of using the composition comprising the step of

applying and photopolymerizing the composition.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention and request withdrawal of the rejections under §112, ¶2.

#### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the pending claims and allow the pending claims. Favorable action with an early allowance of the claims pending is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants  
Roger C. Hahn  
Reg. No. 46,376

**SHERMAN & ASSOCIATES**  
415 N. Alfred Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
703-549-2282